THE WORKERS'
DREADNOUGHT
For International Socialism.

Vol. VI.—No. 2 SATURDAY, APRIL 5th, 1919 Price Twopence.

THE SOVIETS OR PARLIAMENT.

By BUKHARIN, Russian People's Commissary.

The fundamental difference between the parliamentary system and the Soviet power is already known. It is known that the Soviets grant no political rights to the non-producing classes. The country is governed by the councils elected by the working population in the place where they work, in the workshops, the mines, and the villages. The capitalists, the landed proprietors, middle-class intellectuals, bankers, stockbrokers, and speculators, merchants and shopkeepers, priests and monks, in short, all who form the black army of capitalism, are deprived of the right to vote and are without political power.

The Constituent Assembly (or Parliament, the members of which are elected to represent territorial constituencies) is the basis of the Parliamentary Republic. The highest sovereignty of the communist republic belongs to the Congress of Soviets.

In what does the one differ from the other?

In the fact that to the Constituent Assembly, not only are the representatives of the workers and peasants elected, but also the representatives of owners, bankers, and capitalists, the representatives of all the capitalist class and their hangers-on.

THE CAPITALIST DICTATORSHIP.

Experience shows that wherever the bourgeoisie enjoys political rights, it uses those rights to dupe the workers and peasants. Because it has the press, both the daily newspapers and the periodicals, in its hands: because it has great wealth at its disposal, the bourgeoisie is able to corrupt public officials, to employ for its benefit the services of hundreds of thousands of agents; is always able to menace, and to intimidate for its own advantage, its slaves; and, in fact, to organise things in such a way that not a scrap of the power shall escape from its clutches.

All the people apparently participate in the elections, but, under this pretence is hidden the domination of capitalism, which flatters itself that it has granted the people the right to vote and all "democratic" privileges, but which takes good care to preserve its own privileges. Thus in bourgeois republican countries, under the cloak of universal suffrage, the power is found to be entirely in the hands of the great forces of capitalism.

Under the parliamentary system each citizen casts his vote into the ballot box once in four or five years, and the field is then clear for the members of Parliament, Cabinet Ministers, and Presidents, to manage everything without any reference to the toiling masses. Gulled and exploited by its officials, the toilers have no part whatever in the administration of the capitalist state.

THE SOVIET SYSTEM.

In the Soviet Republic, born of the dictatorship of the workers, the administration rests on an altogether new basis. It is not an organisation of officials independent of the masses and dependent on the capitalists. The central government is established on the great class organisations of the workers and peasants: the industrial unions, the factory committees, local workers' and peasants' councils, and organisations of soldiers and sailors. From the centre stretch thousands and millions of conducting threads which lead to the provincial Soviets, the municipal Soviets, the local Soviets, and finally to the factory and workshop Soviets.

Take, for example, the Chief Economic Soviet (or Council). It is composed of representatives of industrial commissions, factory committees, and similar institutions. On the one hand, the industrial unions embrace all industrial activity, they have ramifications in the various towns and are maintained by the masses of the organised workers. On the other hand, there exists to-day in every factory a committee elected by the workers. The factory committees group themselves and send their representatives to the Chief Economic Soviet, which elaborates plans for economic changes and the administration of production. In the same way the central organism of administration is composed of representative workers, and rests upon the mass organisations of the working class.

POPULAR INITIATIVE.

Thus we have an institution quite different from the capitalist republic. Not only because the non-producer is deprived of the right to vote; not only because the country is administered by the workers and peasants, but above all because the Government of the Soviets is in constant relations with the organised masses, and in this way, at all times, the greater part of the population joins in the administration of the State. Every organised worker exercises an influence, not only because, once or twice a month, he elects to represent him men in whom he places confidence, but because the industrial unions can themselves elaborate their own plans of organisation. These plans are examined by the Soviets concerned, by the economic Soviets, and, if approved, they become law as soon as the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets has ratified them. An industrial union, or factory committee can in this way take part in the common work of building up new forms of life.

THE NEW STATUS OF THE WORKERS.

In the capitalist republic the position of the State improves as the activities of the masses are restricted, for the interests of the masses are in conflict with the capitalist State. The Soviet Republic, which embodies the dictatorship of the popular masses, could not subsist for a single instant without their support. On the contrary its strength grows as the masses become more conscious, and as they become more active in every direction: in the factory and the workshop, and in every town and village.

Before the October revolution the organisations of workers and peasants were simply the instruments of the class war against the ruling and possessing capitalists. The organisations fought capital for higher wages and shorter working days, and in the villages they fought for the expropriation of the land. Now that the power is in the hands of the workers and peasants, they have become the wheels of the governmental mechanism. The industrial unions are not merely fighting capitalism. As an organic and integral part of the Workers' Soviet Government they join in the organisation of production and economic activity. In the same way, the village and peasant Soviets, not only wage war upon the village usurers, the capitalists, and the proprietors of the soil, but, as organs of government, as wheels in the mechanism of this giant, the workers and peasants' State, they work to elaborate new agrarian laws.

THE VICTORY OF THE WORKERS.

Thus, little by little, through the organisations of the workers and peasants, the most extensive sections of the active population are summoned to take part in the affairs of State. No other country offers anything to compare with this, because no other country has known the victory of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Republic of the Soviets.

Much had already been written of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but no one knew exactly in what form it would be realised. The Russian Revolution shows us the precise form of that dictatorship. It is the Republic of the Soviets. That is why the arms of the Soviets are inscribed on the banners of the best ranks of the international proletariat.

DREADNOUGHT DEVELOPMENT FUND.

Collecting sheets may be had on application from 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4. OUR FRIENDS and supporters are asked to do all they can to HELP the paper *now*. The circulation has doubled since December, 1918, but it must increase much more. Money is needed to keep up the present standard, and increase the circulation until we have *at least* a million readers.

If you can get a friend to collect also, please do so. Full result will be printed in our May Day Number.

THE GLASGOW TRIAL.

The trial of Comrades Gallacher, Kirkwood, Ebury, Shinwell, Hopkins, and others, who were arrested after the police dispersal of the people outside the Glasgow City Hall, is to take place in Edinburgh on April 7th. Our comrades are charged, amongst other things, with causing terror to the lieges. The Scottish Socialist Information and Research Bureau has decided to issue a daily bulletin giving a full and accurate account of the proceedings at the trial, which is expected to be a lengthy one. Scottish comrades willing to help should call at 196 Vincent Street, Glasgow, between 2.30 and 9 P.M. The W.S.F. will also gladly assist in putting the bulletin into the hand of readers who desire to secure it, if they will communicate with the Literature Secretary, 400 Old Ford Road, London, E.

HANDS OFF RUSSIA!

DEMONSTRATION

VICTORIA PARK,

Sunday, April 6th, 1919, at 4 p.m.

Organised by The East London Workers' Committee Workers' Socialist Federation, London United Socialist Council (East District), with the co-operation of the Shop Stewards' Movement.

BETWEEN OURSELVES. By L. A. Motler.

Such goings on, Henry. There is what is called a Crisis, and the eyes of the nation are fixed on the Miners, the Mineowners, and the Government. But more especially on the Miners. It is no joke being a miner these cold March mornings.

The Extra-special Commission has sat and hatched not one, but three reports, and the Government has fixed on one signed by three capitalists and a judge of the name of Sankey. And nearly all the capitalist press is urging the miners to accept the Sankey terms. Nobody who owns a newspaper has offered to go down the Powell Duffryn pits on the Sankey terms, but then newspaper editors are not miners.

The miners want nationalisation, but the mine-owners are "agin it." They say England is a free country and a man can do what he likes with what is his, and the rights of private property must be respected. The miners mistakenly say that *they* intend doing what they like, then, and the Government says they can—at their own risk. Without wishing to be accused of taking sides, they intend to "win, and win quickly," as Mr. Bonar Law put it so nicely. And if the miners defy the nation, well, did you not see the great march of the Guards through London, Henry?

You do not hear anything about the mine-owners defying the nation. No, nor of the Government defying the Nation. Bless me, didn't the people elect the Government? Didn't they ask the Government to continue Conscription till April, 1920, and three months after? Didn't they ask Mr. "Winnie" Churchill to keep 140,000 troops in Russia and twice as many in Ireland? Didn't they ask the Government to knock down the continuation of the unemployment donation to a quid a week? And wasn't that in order to drive the shirkers back to work, although the Government admit they cannot provide employment (*Star*, March 26, 1919) because that would be competing with private firms?

Mr. Bonar Law said that no Government could exist if the present Cabinet gave way to the miners. Why? Because the present Cabinet, and indeed practically the whole of Parliament consists of business men (or capitalists) and their friends. Therefore, the Government is there to see that "Business is carried on as usual."

For "business" I should read "robbery," Henry.

Supposing, however, the mines were nationalised? That is to say, supposing they were put under control of the State, and declared to be the property of the State. Who is the State?

The State is supposed to be the whole people. But do the people decide that postage should go up an extra halfpenny? Yet the Post Office is the property of the State. But, it has been said, Henry, by alleged Socialist orators that it is better for the State to own an industry than for the private capitalist to do so. These orators are, however, very tame and should be fed on Parliamentary speeches three times a day. They do not want us to be in a hurry, but to go about things in a proper and what is called a "constitutional" way. We all know what legal ways are.

There is a story of a man who said: "If a man stopped me in the street and demanded my watch, I should refuse to give it to him. If he threatened to take it by force, I feel I should—although not a fighting man—do my best to protect it. If, on the other hand, he should assert his intention of trying to obtain it by means of a legal action in a court of law, I should take it out of my pocket and hand it to him; and think I had got off cheaply."

These "constitutional and legal" Socialists do not approve of the idea of the people taking over the land themselves. These "Statesman-like" Socialists want us to elect them to Parliament so that they can do it in a "perfectly proper" way. That means, of course, paying compensation to "owners" who have never done anything to the land but own and draw rent and royalties and wayleaves from it. When the police recover stolen property they do not pay compensation to the burglar. The landowners didn't put the land where it is: it belonged to the people. Therefore, the land has been stolen from the people. Why compensation?

But taking the land back would be violence. It would be Bolshevism. Would it? Let me quote from *The Daily Chronicle* (March 26th, 1919) a capitalist paper owned by friends of our wonderful Prime Minister, who is opposed to violence:—

"Countess' £5,200 seized. The President of the Prize Court condemned as prize £5,200 taken in paper money from Countess Ella Matuschka, wife of a German Count, who was travelling with Count Bernstorff's suite, when he was returning to Germany *under safe conduct*. The British Foreign Office gave permission for 'sufficient money to be carried for the reasonable requirements of the journey.' They allowed the lady to retain £400 and they considered this more than ample." [Italics Ed.]

Talk about Bolshevism to the British Foreign Office, which robs people of money whilst they are "under safe conduct." Safe from whom? Evidently not safe from the Clutching Hand of the British Foreign Office.

And talk about violence. The British War Office forced all the eligible men into the Army as conscripts, took away the widows' sons, and in conjunction with the Home Office is still torturing the conscientious objectors.

The people do not want violence, Henry. It is the Super-Cabinet of brilliant, peace-loving statesmen who want violence. All the people want is their own back. They tilled the land, built the ships, houses and palaces, grew the food, wove the cloth. And what have the people got? They have got an insecure job, a pound a week unemployment pay, and five bob a week if they manage to survive till seventy.

The people are told not to be violent but to keep their proper places. They want their proper places, Henry.

EGYPTIAN AWAKENING.

The Egyptian, A. E. Sayed, in the *Populaire* of March 24th, 1919, throws light on the present situation in Egypt. He says that the day after the armistice certain members of the Egyptian Government, including the Vice-President Elect, Said Zagloul Pasha, were elected as delegates by the Egyptian people to enlighten the Peace Conference as to the true condition of Egypt and to claim independence for the country under the ægis of the League of Nations. Millions of people, amongst whom were all the elected members of the Egyptian Chamber and the county and town councillors, signed the mandates which these delegates were to lay before the Peace Conference. But the mandates were confiscated by the British authorities, and the passports of the delegates were refused without explanation. The delegates protested, first to Lloyd George, then to the representatives of the other Powers, and finally to President Wilson and the Peace Conference itself.

One of the Egyptian Ministers, Ruschdy Pasha, resigned as a protest on December 4th, 1918. The protests of the delegates were entirely peaceful, but nevertheless they were punished by arrest and deportation to Malta. The Egyptian Ministry resigned. On the day of the deportations peaceful protest meetings assembled in the larger towns, but the authorities fired on the people and drove them away at the bayonet's point. Many people were killed or wounded. It was suggested that the peaceful meetings were revolutionary, but Sayed declares that the Egyptians are unable to rebel, because since the beginning of the war, the British authorities have illegally seized all Egyptian arms, so that if the country were scoured it would be difficult to find a single weapon. So much have the people of Egypt been roused by the present outbreak of British coercion that the women have even torn off their veils, broken the gratings of the harems, and gone out in the streets to demonstrate. In Cairo 20,000 of them have joined the demonstrators. Says Sayed: "Ah! Blessed is English Imperialism! The blood of our assassinated brothers has not been shed in vain. The much-desired Social Revolution has taken place. In future the Egyptian women will take an active part in the life of the nation."

L'Humanité on March 19th reports that when the Egyptian demonstrations were dispersed by revolver shots the University students went on strike; the 20,000 students at the great religious University of El Aghar joined the movement. They were fired upon when they held a peaceful meeting in front of the Residence. The next day, March 10th, fresh demonstrations took place, the offices of newspapers subsidised by the British were wrecked, and those who did the work were dispersed with bloodshed by British troops. On

(Continued on page 283).

20,000 MURDERED SEAMEN. FULL COMPENSATION OUR FIRST DEMAND.

On Tuesday, March 4th, Mr. Lloyd George received a deputation from the British Mercantile Marine. The seamen were praised to the skies, as might be expected, and told to present their bill. Lloyd George would see that the Hun paid. He said: "It was part of the Government's instructions to their delegates in Paris that the first demand put forward must be full compensation for losses at sea, *including compensation to the poor people* who had suffered through their relatives having lost their lives, &c."

"So I am entirely with you," concluded the Premier. "I want you now to hurry up with all your claims....and in a very few weeks' time you will find the claim of the British sailors presented to the people who have got to meet it."

This report I extracted from *The Daily Dispatch*. Immediately following it was an article headed 'Slim Hun Kaiserists,' which prompts me to ask if the Hun Kaiserists are the only "Slim" folk. It would never do to suggest that Mr. Lloyd George and his friends are "Slim," but at the same time one may be pardoned by asking him a direct question. What does he mean when he speaks of compensation to poor people who have suffered through loss of relatives?

I have before me "Form B" issued by the Liverpool and London War Risks Insurance Association, Ltd., dated July 14th, 1915, authorising payment of Seamen's Compensation and giving full particulars of conditions under which payments are made. As payments have been made under this award, which is headed "Admiralty Scheme of Pensions, grants and allowances for Officers and Men applicable as from August 3rd, 1914," and as Cathery and the other seamen's officials are fully conversant with this scheme, it would be interesting to know what this move means seeing that a scheme of compensation is already in operation. From a case which has been brought to my notice, and I have no reason to suppose it to be isolated, it would appear to me that there are slimmer folk than the Huns, and if Cathery & Co. have an excess of energy running to waste it would be far better to make use of the powers they have and mind their own union affairs instead of dabbling in political affairs and acting as catspaws for diplomatic diddlers.

One of the clauses of the award reads: "In the event of the widow's re-marriage her pension shall cease, but the Admiralty or Army Council may at their discretion award to her a lump sum not exceeding the amount by which three years' pay or £300 (whichever of the two shall be less), or £150 (if three years' pay shall be less than £150) exceeds the aggregate of (*a*) the total sum already paid in respect of her pension and of the allowances (if any) to children and (*b*) the estimated value of the future allowances (if any) to children.

In the case I have been told of the wife of a Lusitania steward was awarded £44 16*s*. 2*d*. per annum; she re-married and consequently came under the clause named, but on advising the Liverpool and London Insurance Association of her marriage, payment is reported to have been stopped, and in spite of repeated applications to the Secretary, Sir Norman Hill, the commuted payment based on the three years' payment is refused. What are we to think of it?

Here is a Government scheme giving merchant seamen all they want in the way of compensation, and yet those who dispense it sometimes fail to carry out its provisions, whilst the seamen's officials are fooling after political red herrings. If Cathery, Wilson & Co. want to help the seamen let them make use of the powers they have. They are good fighters and it is up to them to quit acting as donkeys chasing Lloyd George's carrots, and give their solid attention to immediate affairs which they can settle and settle effectively if they make up their minds. What is Joe Cotter doing?

Why are they fooling after Huns when more real culprits may be Sir Norman Hill and those responsible for the administration of the Admiralty Scheme?

NED TREWAN.

THE SOLDIER and THE WAR.

The following passages comprise the last of six fragments appearing in the "Dreadnought" from a novel by Dudley Howard Tripp, a young soldier who enlisted early in the war and here records his impressions.

VI.

....All these doubts came upon me in those horrible periods of death and disaster, when my nerves were beginning to quiver and break beneath the perpetual strain of war. I know the meaning of the phase now, see its meaning very clearly, can tell it to you dispassionately enough because for a long time I have had it cut and dried in my mind. But I only saw it vaguely in those 1915 trench days. With the most distressing physical deterioration came those fluctuating mental and moral doubts. The rock ground on which I had built, and of which I had been so sure, seemed suddenly to have no more stability, no more firmness than sand. The foundations of my belief were shifting under my feet; my credulity was gone.

....Why go into it all? You can guess—or perhaps you cannot—the meaning of this phase. You must remember, too, that for a long while I had abandoned all belief in a future life. And this, coupled with my people's poverty and the necessity in myself of making, unaided, my career, gave me as a goal of effort, good, clean happiness whilst I lived.

I looked to nothing beyond, neither to heaven nor hell. You know my reasons: I need not go into them now. But this knowledge, this conviction that the so-called heaven or hell of existence lay within my own heart; that life was to be made or marred, spent or mis-spent on this sphere alone; that the final and only reckoning was the reckoning of mortality, and that, finally, life died for me because personal consciousness died—all this made me more than ever convinced that the joy of life had to be taken at its full tide—in youth, while blood was generous and warm.

And, with this conviction, with the delicious period when adolescence merges into ripe young manhood, with the swelling within my heart of my powers and passions came this fearful cancer. You do not know how greatly, how swiftly I changed. The first exhuberant energy, the vitality that had made soldering, in spite of its harshness, bearable, and then, later, in the early trench days, pleasant—the desire to express my flooding health and love; the buoyancy that bore up against fatigue gave place in a tiny space of time to something mordaunt, ironical and bitter.

And yet, intellectually, I had made a great stride. I mean this: at first one only assimilates; afterwards one assorts and catalogues, and this, the beginning of criticism, leads to creation. That is a great period. Progress is often so swift that one can chronicle it hourly. And yet, in this case, in what a treacherous unworthy hothouse were my faculties being forced!

It is only three years! There is very little, perhaps there is only a memory of the shrinking timid kid of Samuel and Werthemier's warehouse. There is not a great deal more of the enthusiastic young patriot! I have left it all behind, and have found in myself or taken on some new quality that is draining me perpetually of happiness.

Had I not been maimed, disqualified as it were, in life's race I probably would have thrown it off easily enough. But my wounds and cripplement changed me, cut short all healthy, happy development, strangled the growth of tender forbearance in me. I cannot put their influence into words. I only know it is in me now, that it robs me of the desire to write, to make myself loved, even while I long for love. It has imbued me with some spirit of perversity that is stronger than any hopeful effort I can call into being, that will in the end destroy me.

I no longer believe in the rightness of war—of any war. There should be no war. The system that engenders, or permits war is wrong, and should be crushed. I would have worked for its destruction had I come through with saner, sweeter, ideals. Somehow, now, in spite of the knowledge that I play a sullen, ungenerous part, I cannot think with decent charity of the world. I am tainted and accursed. The world does not care for me: it has not lost its limbs. It bustles on in its heedless way, brushes me aside. And I might have done so much! Once I might have done a great deal.

Well, I have learnt the value of life—in losing it! War, if it taught me nothing else, taught me that. At one time I felt that only one's own life was of interest—Noël's death taught me otherwise. Through the death of a friend one learns the value of life.

God! if you can understand! After Noël went war loomed like a monstrous nightmare of injustice and degradation around and above me, and a band of ice seemed to gather my soul into its grip, crushing and mortifying....*black* ice, if you can grasp my meaning....

Years, now—years....

He paused, then rage shook him.

And to think that this need not have happened—that, with the light of a little knowledge, I and other millions of maimed tormented boys might have been spared it; to think that those who teach the common gospel of Humanity are execrated, imprisoned, spat upon! Why! one boy blinded or crippled robs war of all its glory, is enough to shame the heart of the world to tears: one, not the ten or fifteen millions that the casualties total.

As though justice could rise, dovelike, on the altar of the Lord, from fifteen million smoking human hearts....

Still, when Death gets beyond counting, it is of no account, and the tragedy of the world becomes impersonal.

DUDLEY HOWARD-TRIPP.

DOMESTIC SERVICE.

THE REPORT OF THE WOMEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE DOMESTIC SERVANT PROBLEM.

BY JESSIE STEPHEN.

The greatest difficulty which existed in the past has been the utter incapacity of the employers of domestic servants to recognise that the day is long past when a girl of the working class will accept any sort of conditions that it may please her mistress to give her. When the grievances of domestic servants have been aired from time to time it has been alleged that these grievances were the delirious imaginings of "agitators," and others of that ilk. The dear people who held these views must have had a severe shock when they read the report of the Women's Advisory Committee. Quite frankly it states—what was known to all of us who knew anything at all of the problem—that the conditions obtaining in domestic service to-day are such that they require drastic alteration.

Without taking the report in detail it is sufficient to say that from the point of view of the average employer the recommendations are revolutionary. If they were carried out undoubtedly more women would be attracted to domestic service, but there is always that "if." Personally, as I have pointed out in my memorandum I do not think the report goes far enough, in that it lays down no definite minimum scale of wages, nor does it suggest a limitation of the number of hours a servant should remain on duty. To me that is a very vital point because I have been told by employers that I was expected to be on duty 24 hours if necessary.

There was no absolute unanimity in the findings of the committee, as can be observed by the number of memoranda attached to the report. Under no condition would the committee agree to incorporate my memorandum in the report, because, it was said, if the committee were to make a definite recommendation on this head it might hurt the middle class employer who was not able to afford a high wage to a domestic. That seems to me a most impertinent objection. Is a domestic servant to work for low wages because her employer cannot pay any more? Surely it is the duty of such employers to do their own work.

I do not agree either with the recommendation suggesting that employers should supply the uniform, because I think it is high time that the uniform was abolished. In many cases the wearing of the uniform is only insisted on in order that the lady of the house may be able to advertise the fact that she keeps a maid.

Lady Londonderry, in her memorandum sets down her objection to organisation, trade union or otherwise, and incidentally manages to get a free advertisement for her Women's Legion scheme. One can understand women of her type preferring the working class to be unorganised, whether it be domestic servants or factory girls. It makes the worker too independent and that is the last thing that our heaven born aristocracy desire. With the inconsistency usual to reactionaries, she advocates another form of organisation—but perhaps it is not so inconsistent after all—the militarisation of domestic service. It is very nice no doubt to have people bringing their hands up smartly to their noble brows like clockwork toys when you issue an order, but somehow I don't think that domestic servants will "cotton on."

They have had too much of it already. Lady Londonderry's scale of wages, too, is far too low, and that is probably why she does not want domestic servants to organise. But they are organising, and when they are strong enough they will demand much more than even the Women's Advisory Committee has recommended.

[Miss Stephen in her memorandum, which was signed also by Mrs. Jarrett and Miss Whyatt, urged that "domestic workers should not be on duty more than eight hours a day, exclusive of meal times and 'time off.' Where the worker is expected to be on duty more than eight hours she should be paid overtime rates." She also drew up a minimum weekly wage scale, including £1 2*s.* 6*d.* for housekeepers and 18*s.* 6*d.* for assistant housekeepers; £1 2*s.* 6*d.* to 15*s.* for cooks; 12*s.* to 15*s.* for general domestic workers; 7*s.* 6*d.* to 15*s.* for scullery maids and kitchenmaids; 15*s.* to 7*s.* 6*d.* for housemaids; 10*s.* to £1 for parlour maids; 15*s.* to £1 for nurses; 15*s.* to £1 for ladies' maids; 12*s.* 6*d.* to 18*s.* for laundry maids; 12*s.* 6*d.* to 15*s.* for stillroom maids; 10*s.* to 15*s.* for dairy maids; 9*d.* per hour for daily workers if the hours exceed four per day, if less than four 1*s.* per hour; 16*s.* 6*d.* to 10*s.* for unskilled workers from 14 to 18 years. All these rates are to include food, otherwise £1 a week must be added to them. These rates are low enough if the domestic worker is to live comfortably, help her family at need, and prepare for illness and old age. But only the really prosperous household could secure domestic help on this basis. The mother, as in the majority of working-class homes to-day, must shoulder the whole burden of work whether well or ill, or however large the family might be. Only Socialism can solve the domestic problem.

Ed. W.D.]

JUST OUT!

AN EYE-WITNESS FROM RUSSIA, by Dr. Rickman (a member of the Friends' War Victims Committee recently returned from Russia). Post free, 3½d.

Other Recent Publications.

THE RUSSIAN PLAN FOR THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, by George Tchicherine. Post free, 2½d.

RUSSIA AND THE ALLIES, by Seymour Cocks. Post free 3½d.

BRITISH SOLDIERS IN RUSSIA. Post free 1d.

Trade terms for quantities from The People's Russian Information Bureau, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

London Indian Association.

Lokmanya B. G. Tilak.

An Indian Home Rule Leader will speak in **ESSEX HALL**, Essex Street, Strand, W.C., on **MONDAY**, the 7th of **APRIL**, 1919, at 7 P.M., on **Present Situation in India.** Other speakers include Mr. George Lansbury, Colonel Wedgwood, M.P., and Dr. V. H. Rutherford. Admission free. Reserved seats at 1*s.* each. — Apply R. K. L. Nandkeolyar, 12 Alfred Road, Acton, W.3.

DREADNOUGHTS sent to any part of Sheffield by Mr. A. Carford, 183 West Street, Sheffield. Price 9d. per ½ doz. post free.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

EDITOR: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

Published by the Workers' Socialist Federation

Telephone; EAST 1787.

Annual Subscription - Post Free, 10s. 10d.

Back Numbers, 4½d, post free.

MSS. should be addressed to the Editor at 400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3

All business communications to the MANAGER, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

Vol. VI., No. 2. Sat., April 5th, 1919.

LABOUR AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The League of Nations Commission on International Labour, appointed by the Council of Ten in Paris, has devised a "Charter of International Labour Legislation," which it is proposed to insert in the Peace Treaty. The Charter bears a striking resemblance to that adopted by the Government Socialists at Berne. We should not be surprised by that fact; it is not a chance coincidence. The approved policy of all Government Socialists, and of the weaker reformist Liberals, is always to find out what the Government means to give and then to ask for that. The Peace Conference Charter contains many of the out-of-date resolutions of the oldest of ancient conferences on Labour. Most of the things it offers have either been obtained here already or are about to be obtained; the most notable exception being "a reasonable standard of life" for the workers, and of course opinions differ acutely as to what is reasonable! The provisions include:—

Children not to be gainfully employed under 14 years of age.

Persons between 14 and 18 not to do work harmful to their physical development, and to continue their education.

Every worker to have a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life having regard to the civilisation of his time and country.

Equal pay for equal work. A weekly day of rest.

48-hour week, subject to an exception for countries where climatic conditions, industrial development, or other circumstances render the industrial efficiency of the workers substantially different.

[That we suppose means that Africans, Indians, and others whose power of protest is but feebly developed, will have to work longer hours.]

Foreign workers to have the same treatment as nationals.

State inspection of factories and workshops.

A poor programme, but all that the League of Nations has to offer the workers, to prevent them turning to Bolshevik Socialism, which will make the workers the rulers of the world and its destiny. Wilson Harris, in *The Daily News* on March 21st, quoted some personnage at the Peace Conference:—

"Now Bolshevism, whatever else may be said about it, is a tremendous idealistic force—unquestionably the greatest idealistic force, in my opinion, since the birth of Christ. You may vilify it. You may spread reports of its excesses. You may advocate military measures against it. But there it remains—a tremendous idealistic force. There is only one way to fight an ideal. That is by opposing another ideal to it. And there is only one practical ideal in the world to-day that can oppose Bolshevism—the League of Nations."

And then the prophet came tumbling down from the heights and forgot all about idealism, saying: "The first weapon of the League must be food. You must have some force—police or military—to guard your lines of transport, but a loaf in your left hand is going to be more important than a sword in your right."

On March 31st this same Paris correspondent states that an investigator, employed by the British Government to make inquiries in Germany, has just returned and has reported that there will be a change of Government in Germany, but that a mere change of Government will not satisfy the country:—

"The masses of the people would demand some control over administration, and this, it is submitted, could be obtained by the constitution of a national form of workmen's and soldiers' council as the first Chamber....It is argued that such a compromise between the Soviet and Parliamentary systems is necessary to conciliate the masses...."

There is another admission. Firstly, we are told that Bolshevism is the strongest idealistic force since Christ, and, secondly, it is admitted that the parliamentary system does not give the masses of the people control over the government, but that the Soviet system does. The League of Nations is put forward as the one force that can stave off Bolshevism! And this is the Charter which the League of Nations offers to the workers as an alternative to Socialism!

The machinery of the International Labour Office which the Council of Ten ("moved," they say, "by sentiments of justice and humanity"), are about to set up, is as unsatisfactory as the Charter. It consists of a General Conference of four representatives from each of the countries represented; two of these four are to be representatives of the Government, one of employers of labour, and one of the workers. Labour is thus placed in a safe minority of one to three! Each delegate may be accompanied by two advisers, and where women's questions are concerned "one at least of the advisers should be a woman." This is to please the middle-class suffrage societies. Some of them will no doubt feel highly flattered by the idea that the Governments have consented to allow the women to appear occasionally, in the proportion of one to eleven, and that sex barriers in the general League of Nations' machinery are verbally removed. The workers' and employers' delegates are to be selected in agreement with the most representative body of employers and workpeople, and the Conference, by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast, may refuse to admit any delegate not so appointed—Bolshevik views can thus easily be excluded by a vote of the Government and employers' representatives!

The governing body of the International Labour Office is to consist of 24 members: 12 representing the Governments, 6 representing the employers' delegates to the Conference, 6 representing the workers' delegates. Thus Labour is placed in a minority of one to four!

The International Labour Office will collect and distribute information concerning international Labour, and will publish a periodical in English and French.

If any country fails to fall in with the agreements made concerning Labour, a commission of inquiry shall be chosen by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, from a panel consisting of three representatives of the Governments, three representatives of the employers, and three workers' representatives. Any of these representatives, "not deemed to be fully qualified," may be rejected by a two-thirds vote of the governing body. Thus, again, the Government and employers' representatives may together veto any of the workers' representatives to whom they may object. The offending State may appeal from the Commission of Inquiry to the "Permanent Court of International Justice" to be created by the League of Nations, the findings of which will be final! The offending State may have passed upon it "an economic sentence." We suppose this means that it may be blockaded and boycotted, and that its people may be starved. *The Times* states that "the British Dominions and India will have the same rights and obligations as if they were separate high contracting parties, and this will apply to any colony of any signatory which the Executive Council of the League of Nations admits to be fully self-governing." But how can this be? India is not "fully self-governing." She has not even a semblance of self-government; the mass of the Indian people are absolutely without political rights. We wonder whom the British Government will choose to represent Indian Labour; indeed, we can hardly believe that they will allow the masses of the workers and peasants to choose their own representatives freely, though they might safely do so, since Labour in all countries is to be placed in a hopeless minority.

Labour in all countries should refuse to have anything to do with this scheme. It places Labour in an insulting minority. It brings Labour into the international machinery set up by the capitalist Governments to fight Socialism. It is the coping to the national machinery by which the Governments are seeking to divert Labour from the direct, independent action, in which it is daily growing more powerful and successful. In direct action the wire-pullers and negotiators take second place, and the rank and file are the rulers. By direct action the Russian working classes, the industrial workers, the peasants, the soldiers and sailors, established a government and abolished landlordism and capitalism. By direct action the miners won the minimum wage and the eight-hour day; by the threat of direct action they have won the promise of a seven-hour day; by direct action the Glasgow women won the Rent Act.

In the political field Labour's gains are infinitesimal; any concessions made to Labour during the war, and for years before that, were made in fear of strikes outside. The pleadings of Labour men in Parliament fell on deaf ears.

In the committee room and at the conference table Labour, always carefully placed in a minority there, is denied that which it is entitled to demand; and what is more, its spokesmen are too often bamboozled into accepting the denial with thanks, as "an instalment of justice," urging the rank and file to accept it, in order to avoid conflict.

In the International Labour machinery Labour will always be kept in a minority of one to three, or even one to four; and the Council of Ten, by giving to the employers' and governments' representatives the power to reject any of the Labour nominees of whom they may disapprove, will secure that even this representation shall consist of thoroughly tame and subservient people. Evidently there will be secrets to be learnt at the International Labour Committee with which capitalism can only trust selected individuals who are warranted not to tell! Moreover, Labour must be held in complete subjection on this body, because this is the international body which is to act as a drag on all the Whitley Councils set up in the various trades; a drag on the National Industrial Councils in the various countries; this International Council will be like the Local Government Board, which surcharges Poor Law Guardians who relieve too generously, and either refuses to approve, or continually delays, the various housing schemes and schemes for municipal trading put forward by local bodies. Even on the Whitley Councils Labour will be in a minority, for the Chairman appointed by the Government can always cast his vote on the other side. Moreover, when it comes to legislation, the Governments will only adopt the recommendations of these various councils as, and when, it chooses. In the case of the coal inquiry one report was signed by three employers' representatives, one by two employers' representatives and the Chairman, one by six workers' representatives. The majority report was therefore the report of the workers' representatives; but the Government has chosen to act on the report submitted by the Chairman chosen by itself. So, too, with the International Industrial Council. If any combination of circumstances should produce a majority recommendation objectionable to international capitalism, we believe the League of Nations would step in and arrange matters to suit itself. But such a contingency can scarcely arise since the workers are placed in so small a minority.

If the workers were to be diverted from their struggle to better their industrial conditions by the hope that this network of councils would do it for them, their emancipation would indeed be indefinitely postponed. But this will not happen. The toiling masses are just waking to the need for rank and file control of the industrial machine; they have just devised and are perfecting the organisation of that

Continued on page 1281.

FRENCH SOCIALISTS' PROTEST AGAINST THE RUSSIAN SCANDAL.

In the French Chamber on March 23 Marcel Cachin, as reported in *Le Populaire* and *L'Humanité*, addressed the Government: "Our soldiers do not want to go and they are right. In spite of your bate of 5 francs a day (they had but one franc for defending their country) you have not found any volunteers, and I say it is to the honour of the country. From this tribune we call upon the soldiers of France not to enrol in Pichon's army." Cachin explained that French soldiers were captured by the Bolsheviki who said: "You would shoot us if you had made us prisoners, because you have been told that we are bandits; we are sending you back to your units: compare and judge." "When they returned to their units," added Cachin, "these French soldiers who were taken prisoners and then released by the Bolsheviki, refused to fight. Will the French Chamber reproach them?"

Lafont, who followed, complained that the French Government seems unable to reconcile itself to the fall of Czardom and that French soldiers are playing in Russia the part that the soldiers of Brunswick played in 1792-3. In the Ukraine France opposed Vinitchenko as too advanced, supported Peteura, then fired on his troops in Odessa. A few days later, with the approval of the French Command the Czarist colours were displayed and the Imperial hymn, 'God save the Czar' was sung at the funeral of a Russian colonel. On January 26th according to *The Odessa News*, the chief of the French General Staff there, Colonel Anselme, announced extensive military operations in the Ukraine, and that the ballot system for the municipal elections would be "radically altered." The system was adult suffrage! The other laws promulgated by the revolutionary Government were set aside; the land was restored to the landlords, the industries to the employers.

Lafont then quoted the order of a Cossack colonel under General Denikin, which declared that working women should not be imprisoned, but shot or hung by the high road, their dead bodies to remain for three days as a warning. In this army of General Denikin Lafont said there is a certain Krasnov who was a friend of the German Imperial Government. A letter addressed by him to Eichhorn appeared in the Tiflis paper, *Borba* (strife) on January 5th, 1919. He there stated that he was taking measures to prevent the Czecho-Slovaks from reaching the Don region, but found it difficult to maintain friendly feelings towards the Germans amongst the Cossacks. Lafont then dealt with the horrors of the Koltchak régime, which the French Government and its Allies are supporting, and asked: "Why do you make us blush for our Government?

IN SOVIET HUNGARY.

All production and transport are in the hands of the Soviet. The Government has taken over the Press and is using the services of journalists and writers for propaganda. The theatres and cinematographs are free. The cultivation of the fine arts is open to the proletariat. Once a week the bathrooms in hotels and private houses must be placed at the disposal of the children of the community, who will be medically examined at home, and if suffering from infectious diseases will not be sent. The Government has taken over the racecourses, which it will turn into vegetable plots. All *objets d'art* and private possessions are declared public property. The Soviet Housing Council is requisitioning rooms for the poor from the apartments of the wealthy. All religious tuition is banned in schools. Lawyers, engineers, physicians and other professional men are joining trade unions. It is not expected that they will be allowed to work except under State control for the community. All privately directed commercial activity is at a standstill. The banks and shops will be opened as soon as the new organisation for their administration has been perfected and if experience proves they are necessary and useful.

Everyone who is willing to work will receive from the State a wage which will enable him or her to live decently and enjoy a higher standard of happiness than under the old system. The sale of all alcoholic drinks is forbidden under a penalty of 50,000 crowns.

The banks are to be nationalised. All dwelling houses are declared to be the property of the Soviet Republic, persons living in their own houses must pay rent to the Government, except workmen and officials. A Commissariat for Health will shortly be established and doctors will be paid by the Government.

THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE AND THE STRIKE.

The Miners' Executive has recommended the Federation to accept the Government offer and not to strike for their charter. The letter sent out by Robert Smillie and Frank Hodges displays them as believers in progress by conciliation. South Wales has again shown itself the rebel element in the Federation. The question of acceptance will be decided by the ballot; but even should they go for accepting the terms the matter will remain unsettled. The question of nationalisation is to be reported on on May 30th. The Government's proposals under this head are certain to be unsatisfactory: again, the miners will be faced with the question whether to fight or compromise; whether to make an attempt to become the masters of the mines or whether to remain merely wage slaves. The other parties to the Triple Alliance have also given way.

"President Wilson and his friends; Lloyd George and his friends are doing what they can. ....Lord Robert Cecil and Colonel House are wholehearted supporters of the League.....Mr. Lloyd George and the American delegates have vainly tried to speed up the work of the Conference....Mr. Lloyd George has again and again declared that the settlement must be one that leaves no bitterness, and that we must not create other Alsaces and Lorraines by robbing Germany of either part of the territory on the Rhine or in West Prussia."

All the delay, all the mercenary grabbing, all the cruel starvation of defenceless peoples by the blockade, the intervention in Russia—are all these supposed to be due to France and Italy? It is absurd to suggest it. America and Britain are more powerful, more able to impose their will than France and Italy. Moreover, every day brings further news showing that Britain and America are playing an active part in all that is going forward.

Our Government is blockading the starving peoples of Europe. We are sending war equipment to those who are fighting the Bolsheviki, beside taking a hand in the fighting ourselves. We are sliding gradually into a great international war. The new Army Annual Bill authorises a military force of 2,650,000 men, exclusive of those serving in India. It extends the penalties to those who encourage or assist deserters, to those who do the same for absentees. It provides penalties up to two years' imprisonment for those who spread reports prejudicial to recruiting. The Navy is appealing for volunteers for Russia, to sign on for nine months. Boatswains and motormen are to get £13 10*s*. a month, A.B.s and firemen £12 a month, free kit or an allowance, and, in addition, "river transport allowance" of £2 2*s*. a week to start on April 12th. The American Government is asking for 50,000 volunteers for three years' service in Europe—for Italy, France, or Russia. The French Foreign Minister on March 26th gave the following figures of troops in Russia:—

Archangel / 13,100 British; 4,820 Americans; 2,349 French; 1,340 Italians; 1,280 Serbians, and 11,770 Russians.

Siberia / Czecho-Slovaks, 55,000; Poles, 12,000; Serbians, 4,000; Italians, 2,000; British, 1,600; French, 760; Japanese, 28,000; Americans, 7,500; Canadians, 4,000; making a total of 118,000 men to which Pichon says must be added 92,000 Russian forces.

East Russia / French, 140,000; Rumanians, 190,000; British, 140,000; Italians, 40,000; Serbians, 140,000; Greeks, 200,000.

It is by no means certain that these are *all* the Allied troops in Russia. Regarding the military situation, the Allies seem to be losing ground in the north and south, whilst Koltchak is said to be gaining in the Urals.

It is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that strong forces are driving the Allied countries further and further into the war against Socialism. It is not only *The Morning Post* which declares: "Bolshevism must be fought" and "in Russia." *The Daily Chronicle* also says: "The Associated Powers....are at war with Russian Bolshevism and we see no easy prospect of their making peace with it."

Now that Hungarian Bolshevism has joined Russia, it is important to notice that the General Assembly of Berlin Workers' and Soldiers' Councils, by 1,470 votes to 20, sent a telegram of congratulation to Soviet Hungary, pledging itself not to rest "until the final victory of Socialism is assured." But a short time ago the Berlin Workers' and Soldiers' Council declared for Parliamentary Government with a Coalition, and against the Soviet form of Government with immediate Socialism; the change is significant and will shortly result in action. Even official Germany is growing more independent in its attitude towards Allied demands, and seeing it the Allies grow less truculent. Whilst the workers of Central and Eastern Europe turn towards the Soviets, the Allies prepare to fight Hungary as well as Russia. Reuter reports that Foch has consulted with the Council of Four regarding the military aspect. *Le Populaire*, March 26th, announces that two British monitors have arrived in Budapest. E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

LABOUR AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Continued from page 1280.

control; they are just beginning to see, that by travelling resolutely onward in that direction, they can take into their own hands the entire machinery of production and can govern society itself. It is impossible that they should leave behind that broad, inspiring prospect and revert to a still greater dependence upon official leaders. Above all, it is impossible that the workers should revert to dependence upon leaders who, failing to see the vision of rank and file co-operation, and the triumph of the workers, have entered into partnership with the capitalists by accepting seats upon the Joint Industrial Councils. When Arthur Henderson joined the Coalition Government he gave his support to Conscription, the Defence of the Realm Act, and the Munitions Act, all of which were used to coerce the workers. He surrendered his freedom of independent protest; he accepted responsibility for the majority decision of the Cabinet; his lips were sealed. He has since declared that there were doings by the Coalition Government which, in his view, were detrimental to the interests of the workers whose representative he was, and to society as a whole. He has said that he could embarrass the Government by disclosing these matters. But he reveals them to no one, because, having joined the Government, he holds himself bound to keep its secrets. We strongly disagree with this view; we think it is Henderson's duty to make these matters public; we think he should have done so as soon as they came to his notice. At the same time we know that every artifice will be used to induce the members of the various so-called Labour Councils to consider themselves bound to help in enforcing the decisions of the Councils. Only those Labour representatives who are prepared to accept the Henderson standard of honour will be acceptable to the Governments and the employers as members of these Councils.

The Powers that be are complacently preparing this network of Councils, which will take many months to arrive at even the simplest decisions, and which on big controversial matters cannot decide at all. Perhaps it is hoped that the workers will take years to discover that the Councils are ineffective.

Henderson and Huysmans, so often publicly snubbed by the Allied Governments, yet still playing the part of eager messenger boys to them, are busy in all these intrigues. *The Daily Herald* reports that Henderson, Ramsay MacDonald, Stuart Bunning, Branting, Renaudel, Longuet, and Huysmans are conferring in Paris on the Berne resolutions, the organisation of the International and the International Labour News Agency; Henderson is also conferring with the British peace delegation, including Lord Robert Cecil, in regard to these matters. Ah, this wire-pulling and conferring with the guardians of capitalism! Organised on this basis it was no wonder that the Berne Conference condemned the Bolshevik Revolution. The International Labour News Agency will be equally safe, equally useful from the capitalist point of view. Mr. Henderson will be able sincerely to assure Lord Robert that its effort will be to act as an antidote to Bolshevism. We have the capitalist press, the Ministry of Propaganda, and now we are to have the news bulletins of the Joint Councils of employers and trade union officials, and the International Labour News Agency!

And here is *The Herald* telling us a most curious story of the European situation:—

THE HERALD AND RUSSIA.

George Lansbury, in the first number of the new *Daily Herald*, says that William Bullett, "a leading official in the peace delegation," and Lincoln Steffins, "an eminent writer," have been to Russia and have reported favourably of the Soviet Government. Other people have also been to Russia: John Reed, Albert Rhys Williams, Arthur Ransome, Philips Price, Dr. Rickman, Reynolds Ball, and Bessie Beatty—all these have reported in favour of the Bolshevik administration, but Lansbury has not hitherto paid much attention to such reports; he has hitherto said that the evidence for and against the Soviets is equally reliable. The reports of Bullett and Steffins have at last stirred him to write thus:—

"The stories of outrage and assassination are proved to be no greater, and indeed much less, than have happened during previous revolutions on so large a scale as the Russian; that the killing of Captain Cromie was brought about owing to the unwarranted interference in Russian affairs by some French and British officials; that the present administration in Russia is clean and uncorrupt; that all the tales of nationalisation of women are pure and simple lies; that the task of re-organising the industries is proceeding everywhere."

We are glad that Lansbury has at length arrived at the point of making that statement, and we hope that he will not recede from it.

But he goes on to add:—

"I do not in anything I have said defend what Lenin and Trotsky have done."

What have they done that Lansbury refuses to defend? Let him declare it! To write thus is to stab them in the back with innuendo. What is it he refuses to defend? Is it the establishment of a "clean and uncorrupt" administration? It is the only such administration in the world, as Lansbury must certainly admit, for he can find no other answering to that description. Is it the re-organisation of industry on a Socialist basis, the dispossessing of the capitalists and landlords, that he will not defend? Let him speak out.

He continues:—

"The position of the French Army, if it is still at Odessa, is perilous in the extreme. Our men at Archangel and in the Murman will be in a tight place once the thaw begins, and *a big defeat, or even a small disaster, may compel either Government to embark on huge expeditions.*"

Why should they be so compelled? What does Lansbury mean? Does he mean that British and French prestige would so suffer from a defeat by the Bolsheviki, that Lloyd George and Clemenceau would have to retaliate by crushing the Soviets, in order to rehabilitate themselves in the eyes of the world? Surely not! Lansbury as a pacifist should have a higher ideal of honour! But if he does not mean this, what does he mean? He cannot think that if the Bolsheviki could defeat the French at Odessa and the British at Murmansk and Archangel, they would follow up their success by invading or blockading France and Britain, and placing us "under the heel of Russian militarism." Russia has not the means to do such things. Moreover, as Lansbury knows, the Bolsheviki are international Socialists and their armies will never march except at the call of Socialism. Why should he lend countenance to the false standards set up by capitalist jingoism? What does Lansbury mean? Let him speak out.

Again he writes:—

"Peace on a more certain foundation is possible, a peace of justice and understanding, and one which would bring Russia into the League of Nations at once....Russia will agree not to interfere in the affairs of other nations; the border States, such as Finland, Esthonia, Lithuania and Ukraine to choose their own form of government. Russia will agree to pay the French and other international debts."

What does all this mean? The words appear to be carefully chosen to avoid offending capitalistic susceptibilities. Why is this done in a Labour paper, since it means the truth is thereby obscured? As a matter of fact, to say: "Russia will agree not to interfere in the affairs of other nations," is to say that the Workers' Government of Russia will refrain from Socialist propaganda beyond its borders, though Socialism is the great hope of the workers of the world, and from sending help of any kind to Socialists who may appeal to it from abroad. Soviet Russia has already given to Finland, Esthonia, Lithuania, and the Ukraine the right to decide their own destiny and a complete independence, which Mr. Lansbury has not yet come to the point of advocating for India or Ireland, though he demands for them local autonomy and Home Rule within the British Empire.

"The French and other international debts," which Lansbury says "Russia will agree to pay," are the debts incurred by the Czardom, some for the crushing of the Revolution in Russia, some for the prosecution of the capitalist war with Germany. They also represent the money which private individuals have sunk in Russia in order that for all time they and their heirs may draw dividends out of the Russian soil and the labour of the Russian people.

Those huge debts can only be paid by prolonging the hideous privations of the Russian peasants, and by burdening with iniquitous charges to non-producing capitalist parasites abroad the workers in the Socialised industries of Russia, who have thrown off their capitalist parasites at home.

Lansbury's information that Russia is willing to surrender, thus far, her Socialist principles, in order that further bloodshed may be avoided and the blockade raised, may be correct. Perhaps Allied capitalism has so far triumphed; but to describe this as "a peace of justice and understanding" is a mistake of which we wish Lansbury and his *Daily Herald* were incapable!

Lansbury adds:—

"Before another man or gun is sent to Russia, we have a right to be told all the Government is able to tell us about the possibility of peace. Not a single British soldier should be left in Russia if there is any possibility of bringing him away."

Here, again, we complain, and with good reason: "the POSSIBILITY of peace"! Indeed, the only thing that hinders peace is the Allied Jingo capitalism. As Lansbury himself says in the same column. Why, then, does he water down the good that is in him by this absurd posturing on the fence? The workers' demand, above all the Socialist demand, must be clear cut and unmistakable: it must be that the Allied armies should clear out of Russia unconditionally, and that the debts incurred either by the Czar or the capitalist coalitions that for a brief period succeeded him shall be written off as more of the many irrecoverable losses of a capitalist war. To those who remind us that Winston Churchill has said that weather conditions, as yet, make it difficult to withdraw Allied troops from Northern Russia, we can confidently reply that, if this be true, the Soviet Government will have no objection to giving these troops temporary hospitality, provided it is clearly understood that they will go as soon as weather allows them, and that they will behave themselves peaceably, obey the laws of Soviet Russia, and refrain from interference in Russian affairs meanwhile.

Our readers should realise that one's attitude towards Soviet Russia is not merely a question of one's opinion concerning the affairs of any one of the many foreign countries. One's attitude toward Soviet Russia is one's attitude towards Socialism in the first country where it has happened to arise. Therefore to ask: "Do you support Soviet Russia?" is really to inquire: "Are you a Socialist?"

Lansbury wants to get Russia into the League of Nations. How strange that he has not realised it is a League of Capitalist Governments against Socialism! Lansbury adds: "British Labour, *now its own fight for the moment* is postponed, must give time and thought to the international situation." Labour's fight "postponed"? Who postponed it? Lansbury has made a mistake.

RUSSIA HONOURS JAURÈS.

L'Humanité, March 16th, reprints from the November 27th issue of the *Troisième Internationale*, the organ of the French Section of the communist (or Bolshevik) party of Russia, an account of the inauguration ceremony of the monument erected by the Soviet Government to the memory of Jean Jaurès. This monument stands in the Novinski Boulevard, Moscow.

The Soviet Government was represented by Sverdlov, President of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets (the news of whose death at the age of 34 has just reached this country), by Maxim Litvinov, former ambassador in London and other well-known personalities.

Kamenev extolled in Jaurès the tribune, the man of fruitful political action who had electrified the world with the magnificence and power of his creative ideas. He deplored the base assassination. Kamenev quoted Trotzky who had said: "It seems that the war, before swooping down on the world, had grasped the fact that it could not impose its bloody tyranny on humanity before striking down Jaurès, its most formidable onemy."

Sadoul spoke of the clear and luminous genius of Jaurès who was a deep philosopher, a magnificent writer, an admirable poet; the inspired chief and ardent soul of the French proletariat, the greatest orator of modern, and probably of all times. Sadoul dealt with the questions: What would Jaurès have done against the war; What would Jaurès have done for the Revolution? Though Jaurès knew that capitalism meant permanent warfare and that only Socialism could bring a final peace, he endeavoured to organise the proletariat against the war. Against wars of adventure he had advocated the general strike and insurrection. He foresaw and prophesied that the outcome of the war would be—revolution, and declared it to be the right and the duty of the proletariat to evolve the social revolution out of the war. If he had lived, said Sadoul, Jaurès with his revolutionary fervour, his clearsighted genius would have been foremost among the western Socialists to understand the beauty and the grandeur of the Bolshevik revolution and to stretch out the hand of friendship to Lenin. Jaurès and Lenin! What an invincible power would the International Revolution have possessed under the direction of two such incomparable guides!

SOCIALIST CHILDREN'S ENTERTAINMENT.

A most successful entertainment was given by the children of the Portsmouth Socialist School last week at Portsmouth Trades Hall, a programme being carried out which made no mean call on the young artists' musical ability and dramatic talent. The main feature was a representation of 'Maurice's Own Idea,' a play by the well-known actor-playwright, Miles Malleson. The choice of this play was fully justified, each part being adequately rendered, thus ensuring a successful achievement. The somewhat arduous title-role was given by Doris Owen with charming ingenuity, and every performer was worthy of praise. A unique item was provided by a sketch in Esperanto, 'Snow White and the Dwarfs,' giving a practical demonstration of the ease with which this universal language may be acquired. In addition a varied concert programme was carried out, the songs in character by Colina Grey, Lily Owen, and Alan Barber being much appreciated. Four merry Jack Tars sang 'Four Jolly Sailor Boys,' and other songs were contributed by Ethel Holden and Jack Wopplington. Among the recitations was an able rendering of 'The Pied Piper of Hamelin,' by Yvonne Roberts; 'The Trials of an Inventor's Wife,' by Bert Foster; and other pieces by Enid and Willie Morgan and Arthur Wickham. Mr. Moore, a skilful accompanist, contributed much to the general success.

J. K.

OUR MAY DAY ISSUE

WILL BE A SOVIET NUMBER
WITH SPECIAL NEWS OF HUNGARY

and will appear on May 1st.

LONDON & DISTRICT WORKERS' DEFENCE COMMITTEE.

Secretary pro tem: MRS. HOLLOWAY,
7 Featherstone Buildings, Holborn, W.C.

Donations towards this defence and maintenance fund are urgently needed. Guaranteed weekly subscriptions are most acceptable.

Parliament As We See It.

March 24th.—The Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Samuels, introduced a Public Health Bill which "extends to Ireland the benefits of medical treatment already enjoyed by children in English elementary schools." In short, there is *now* to be medical inspection in Irish schools; whereas in England *compulsory* inspection has existed for about twelve years, this measure which is being extended to Ireland at this late date is only *optional*. Mr. Devlin (I.N.) deprecated introducing this Bill just now, since the Ministry of Health Bill was before the House and both might be combined. The Bill was given a second reading.

P. R. IN IRELAND.

It was an "Irish night" so to speak! Mr. Samuels moved that the Local Government (Ireland) Bill be given a second reading. It was, he said, "a Bill of considerable importance, for the local government of Ireland in the future." We must ask why this sudden solicitude about Ireland? First a Bill is introduced to show the world that the conditions in Irish schools are not those of the dark ages, but that actually medical inspection *may* take place. Now local government is to be tampered with, not at the instigation of the Irish. Is it out of any solicitude for Ireland's *real* welfare? We fear not. Mr. Samuels showed by his later remarks how small a part that plays. It is again "filthy lucre." As an argument for the Bill he said: "I think the loans to local authorities now total £26,000,000, and it is the local authorities who have to administer this vast sum....bodies which have been absolutely captured by people who call the rest of the United Kingdom 'the enemy,' and whose object is to make the whole administration in Ireland impossible." The question at issue is whether a British Parliament has any right to pass laws for Ireland without consulting the Irish masses! If the "people" really have captured the machinery of local government, it seems that those "people" are representative of Irish opinion. It is an anachronism for Westminster to impose new laws on Ireland in 1919, since in December, 1918, the Irish decided, by a huge majority, for self-determination.

WHOSE ENEMY?

March 25th.—In reply to Viscount Curzon, Mr. Churchill said he could not specify casualties in various areas, as it would give "information to the enemy"! The percentage of casualties in Archangel he admitted to be 1 per cent between January 1st and March 12th, in Murmansk one in five hundred.

INCREASED RENT.

The Rent Bill in its amended state was committed to a Committee, whose duty it is to show why the House is not in agreement with the Lords' amendments. The most serious amendment which was rejected was the proposal, on the part of the Lords, that the proposed 10 per cent increase in rent should be supplemented in 1920 by a 25 per cent increase of the standard rent. One recognises the landlord touch here.

PROTECTION.

A motion for Imperial Preference was debated; it is evident that the temper of the House favours this Preference, which is mere camouflage for Tariff Reform.

INTERVENTION.

Colonel Gretton (CU) moved the adjournment with the object of advocating intervention in Russia, although he admitted that all information about that country was "very unreliable." Mr. Churchill's strongest argument was "the danger of rash interference or meddling" in Russia by the Allies, action which might rally all Russians to the Bolsheviki. But the "meddling" of the Allies has already helped the Bolsheviki in this direction! He admitted that General von der Goltz, at the head of a German force, was helping the Allies near Windau and Riga!

THOSE BOLSHEVISTS!

March 26th.—All "well-known Russian Bolshevists" are to be deported, Mr. Bonar Law admitted. Who are they, one must ask?

CONSCRIPTION.

The Naval, Military, and Air Service Bill was debated on March 25th and 26th. Capt. Guest pointed out the necessity of a sufficiently large army being maintained "to face" the situation in Egypt. And that when the Egyptians are only asking for self-determination! Mr. J. Jones (Lab.) rightly protested against sending British soldiers to Egypt and Russia "to collect dividends on the bonds of people who have invested their money there. If they want their money, let them go out and collect it themselves"!

An amendment to curtail the duration of the Bill was defeated. Mr. Churchill remarking: "....experience bought is better than experience taught....I assure the House that the state of the world at the present time will not permit us to dispense with a strong military force." Mr. Arnold (L.) moved that men procured for the Army under the Act should not be liable to service in any part of the territory formerly included in the Russian Empire. This motion was also defeated, and the people of this country would do well to ponder over the words of Churchill when objecting "to narrow by legislation the duties of the soldier." He said: "*If the House wished to prevent operations taking place in Russia they could do so at any time by bringing pressure to bear on the Government of the day, whatever it is. That is the Parliamentary remedy....*" Colonel Wedgwood (C.L.) denounced the plans of "our Imperialists," to create "perpetual state of war to beat back revolution." It seems he has recognised that there may be a combine of *all* imperialists to crush Revolution; but what is he going to do about it? Will he take Mr. Churchill's advice?

KOLCHAK.

March 27th.—Mr. Harmsworth stated on behalf of the Government that "Admiral Kolchak's Government enjoys the support and sympathy of His Majesty's Government."

CRUELTY TO CHILDREN.

The British Government seems to have lost all sense of proportion, two boys aged eleven and fourteen have been arrested in Ireland and are being kept in custody. According to Mr. Samuels: "They are detained in the interests of justice, and are receiving all proper care and attention." Are not these children being used for that most despicable trade, that of informers? Will they answer the questions asked, and if not will they be coerced into betraying their fellow men?

HUNGARY.

Mr. Bonar Law: "It has not been decided to raise the blockade of Hungary"!

SLOUGH SCANDAL.

Much time was wasted in debating the Slough motor repairing works, which has been so widely condemned. Mr. Churchill showed the attitude of the Government by saying: "....we are indifferent to any course which may be adopted by the House in regard to an inquiry." When *will* progressive thinkers decide to drop this sham democratic institution and proceed with organisation on Soviet lines? It is futile to expose one small item of Government waste—the same story is true of most war departments.

RUSSIA.

Colonel Guinness (C.U.) moved the adjournment to urge on the Government the recognition of General Kolchak's Government! This encouragement induced Mr. Cecil Harmsworth to repeat fully the nature of the support the Government is giving Admiral Kolchak, who by the way is a self-appointed dictator. "We have sent him guns, rifles, and ammunition, and instructors in some of the more difficult branches of the art of war...." So much for the avowed policy of not interfering in the "internal affairs" of Russia!

NURSES' REGISTRATION.

March 28th.—A second Reading was given the above Bill which received general support.

M. O'C.

NO CRIME TO KILL JAURES!

Villain, the man who killed Jaurès, has been acquitted, and Mme. Jaurès was insultingly awarded damages of one franc. The jurymen (were they bribed?) have decided that it is no crime to kill a Socialist. Will Cottin, who shot at Clemenceau because he believed him to be a social danger, also be acquitted? We advise our French comrades to inquire closely into the question of actual bribery, and the precise method of choosing the jury in this particular case, whether the jurymen were specially sounded as to their views and so on. The writer of *The Manchester Guardian* London letter re-tells the story of how Jaurès a few hours before he was assassinated called on the French Foreign Minister and was met by a young secretary with a message that the Minister would not see him. Jaurès told the messenger to take a message that if the French Government would not hold Russia back he would raise the Social Revolution against them, adding that he knew he might be taken out and shot for it. From the Ministry he drove to the restaurant where he was shot. His murderer has been kept untried for four and a half years and is now acquitted!

THE ITALIAN SOCIALIST PARTY JOINS THE BOLSHEVIK INTERNATIONAL.

The Executive Committee of the Italian Socialist Party realise that the International Socialist Bureau is henceforth an instrument of the war policy of the pseudo-democratic bourgeoisie, that it tends to the mystification of the workers, and constitutes only a hindrance to the resumption of the revolutionary Socialist International.

All the efforts to put life into the activities of the Socialist proletariat through the medium of the International Socialist Bureau, which is a hostage of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the Entente, have been in vain. The alliance brought about in Berne between the patriotic-Socialist tendencies of Entente Imperialism and similar tendencies of the imperialism of the Central Empires has revealed the reactionary character of all the factions which have failed to keep the engagements made by the International against the capitalist bourgeoisie which has involved the peoples in war. Consequently, we cannot contemplate the co-existence in one association of those who adhered to the principles of the International, and of those who betrayed it, and who are even now, opposing the realisation of Socialism. Instead of summoning its affiliated organisations immediately hostilities were suspended, the Bureau lent itself to promoting the success of the Berne Conference, which was only a caricature of a Socialist International. The Committee of the Italian Socialist Party therefore resolved to dissociate itself from the Bureau and to adhere to and to work for the constitution of the revolutionary Socialist International on the basis and the principles proposed by the Russian Communist comrades, and for the convocation of a Socialist International Conference decided upon in Moscow in January last. The Italian Socialist Party further resolves to spare no effort to ensure that the Socialists of the whole world who have remained faithful to the International, should adhere to such a conception, either by summoning them, pending the Moscow Congress, to a preliminary Conference, or by any other means conducive to the realisation of the proposed aim.

This resolution was carried by ten votes to three and signed by Gennari, Serrati, and Bombacci. It was opposed by Lazzari, Bacci and Rondani. Bacci opposed the resolution on the ground that the Italian Socialist Party, instead of leaving the International, should use all its energies to expel from it all those who have betrayed it.

To create a Third International whilst the representative organ of the second was still in existence would, he thought, produce a pernicious confusion in the ranks of the proletariat.

EGYPTIAN AWAKENING.

(Continued from page 1278.)

March 11th blood continued to flow in the course of the tumult. A general strike was proclaimed: Egyptian workers, officials, lawyers, and magistrates took part. The military authorities, says the *Temps*, energetically opposed the extension of the movement. General Allenby, the "hero" of Palestine, set up courts martial, while Cairo was guarded by the military.

According to Reuter the killings which have already taken place are described by the British Commander-in-Chief in Cairo as "nothing but defensive measures," and he informed the Egyptian nobles that he was "now faced with the necessity of employing measures of active repression, which must bring tremendous suffering on the people and result in a great loss of public and private property, in which many innocent persons must of necessity become involved."

E. M. Foster, writing in *The Manchester Guardian*, says that the present unrest lies in deeper causes than the grievances of Nationalist politicians. The fellahin are embittered by the methods of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force. Egyptians were seized by compulsion for the British Army in Palestine, the head man of each village being informed how many men he must provide. In the Army, says E. M. Foster, "the official view apparently was that Egyptians are never ill but if ill are certain to die, and treatment seems scarcely to have existed....a plaintaive little popular song was born and sung to a minor tune about the streets:—

'My native town, Oh, my native town,
The military authorities have taken my boy.'"

Mr. Francis' answer to Mr. Halls is again held over because Mr. Francis in his reply has assumed that Mr. Halls in saying he "professes to hold Socialist views" was accusing him of hypocrisy. We are sure Mr. Halls had no such intention. If we had thought so we should not have inserted the letter as *The Dreadnought* deprecates individual and personal recrimination.

WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION.

For Revolutionary International Socialism, the ending of Capitalism and Parliaments, and substitution of a World Federation of Workers' Industrial Republics.

Membership open to all Men and Women. Subscription 4d. per month, 4s. per annum.
Write to the Secretary, 400 Old Ford Road, London, E.3.

LONDON MEETINGS.

SATURDAY, APRIL 5th.
Holloway District.—Meetings outside Jones' Bros., Holloway Road, 3 P.M., and at Giesbach Road (near Archway Tavern), 6.30 P.M. Speakers: Miss Birch, Miss O'Neil, Mrs. Thring, Mrs. Walker, and others.

SUNDAY, APRIL 6th.
Osborn Street, Whitechapel.—11.45 A.M., Miss O'Neil, Mr. J. G. Stone.
"Salmon and Ball."—11.45 A.M., Mrs. Walker.

FRIDAY, APRIL 11th.
The Square, Woolwich.—12 (noon), Miss O'Neil, Mrs. Walker.

SATURDAY, APRIL 12th.
Great Push in Hammersmith.

INDOOR.

FRIDAY, APRIL 4th.
20 Railway Street.—8 P.M., Sylvia Pankhurst.

MONDAY, APRIL 7th.
44 Malden Road, St. Pancras W.S.F.—2.30 P.M., Business Meeting.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9th.
St. Leonard's Academy, Leytonstone High Road.—7 P.M., Mr. A. Moss: 'Conscription and Its Consequences to the Worker.'

THURSDAY, APRIL 10th.
20 Railway Street, Poplar W.S.F. Study Circle.—8 P.M., Philip Edmunds: 'Marxian Economics.'

FRIDAY, APRIL 11th.
20 Railway Street.—7.45 P.M., Speakers' Class.

SUNDAY, APRIL 13th.
20 Railway Street.—7 P.M., Arnold Lupton: 'Old Slavery in New Governments.' Chair: Mrs. Cressall. Discussion.

FRIDAY, APRIL 18th.
3 Great Garden Street, Whitechapel.—8 P.M., Meeting (London Section).

OTHER ORGANISATIONS.

OUTDOOR.

HANDS OFF RUSSIA COMMITTEE.

SUNDAY, APRIL 6th.
Victoria Park.—4 P.M., Miriam Price, Melvina Walker, R. H. Pollitt, John Syme, Jack Tanner, G. H. Russell, A. A. Watts.

INDOOR.

EAST LONDON WORKERS' COMMITTEE.

FRIDAY, APRIL 4th.
400 Old Ford Road.—7.30 P.M.

SUNDAY, APRIL 6th.
400 Old Ford Road.—7.30 P.M., Social (in aid of the Ramsay and Watson Fund).

FRIDAY, APRIL 11th.
400 Old Ford Road.—7.30 P.M.

WALTHAMSTOW LEAGUE OF RIGHTS.

TUESDAY, APRIL 8th.
William Morris Hall, Somer's Road.—3 P.M., Mrs. Cressall.

GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGED.

GENERAL FUND.—Poplar W.S.F., £2 10*s.*; Profit on Social, £1 19*s.* 5*d.* COLLECTION: Bow At Home, 10*s.* 2*d.*

SOCIAL WORK.—Nurse Hobbes (weekly), 10*s.*; Mrs. Richmond (fortnightly), 10*s.*

'DREADNOUGHT' FUND.—Poplar W.S.F., £2 10*s.*; per Mr. A. S. Hull, £1 10*s.*; Mr. J. Prelooker, £1 1*s.*; Anonymous, £1; Mrs. Brimley (2*s.* 6*d.* weekly), 12*s.* 6*d.*; Mr. H. Bool, 10*s.*; Mr. W. E. McConnell, 10*s*; Dr. and Mrs. Schutze (monthly), 10*s.*; Mr. J. Reid, 10*s.*; Mr. Stratton, 2 dollars; Mrs. Baillie Weaver (2*s.* 6*d.* monthly), 7*s.* 6*d*; Mrs. Richmond, (2*s.* fortnightly), 6*s.*; Mrs. S. J. Hayward, 5*s.*; Mr. J. A. Morton (monthly), 5*s.*; Mr. Toop (2*s.* 6*d.* monthly), 5*s.*; per Miss Birch, 3*s.* 6*d.*; Mrs. F. Thomas, 2*s.* 6*d.*; Mr. A. Smith, 2*s.* 3½*d.*; Mr. F. Cooper, 2*s.*; Mrs. L. Katzoff, 2*s.*; Miss O'Neill, 2*s.*; Anonymous, 1*s.*; Barking Women's Co-operative Guild, 1*s.*; Barking Women's Section Labour Party, 1*s.*; Mr. J. Dias, 1*s.*; Mr. J. M. Rout, 1*s.*; Mr. E. Collins, 6*d.*

MISCELLANEOUS ADVERTISEMENTS

Classified advertisements one penny per word. Displayed advertisements 7s. 6d. per inch. Pre-pay and send to Manager, "Workers' Dreadnought," 152 Fleet Street.

FAMILY LIMITATION DOCTRINE. Post free, 1½d. —Malthusian League, 48, Broadway, Westminster.

VOTE FOR THE CHILDREN'S BIRTHRIGHT.—15*s.* a week to every child in our midst as proudly welcomed citizens till they reach the age of 21 years, and £1 a week for everyone at 60.
MacKenzie-Kennedy Advert.

READ
"THE RED DAWN," a Monthly Magazine for Young Workers. Monthly, TWOPENCE.

CIGARETTES MADE BY SOCIALISTS.
Socialists who want a really good article should communicate with us.
GUARANTEED HAND MADE. FROM PURE TOBACCO
Made fresh daily. 5*s.* 6*d.* per 100 post free.
Special terms to clubs and branches.
LYONS & SONS, 255, Franciscan Rd., London, S.W.

WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION.

ANNUAL MEETING will be held SUNDAY, APRIL 13th. at 2.30 p.m. in the Council Room, A.S.E. Institute, Stanley Street, Wicker.

AGENDA:
FINANCIAL STATEMENT.
RE-ELECTION OF OFFICERS.
UNITY WITH S. L. P.

Will members make a special effort to attend. Sympathisers also invited.
A. CARFORD, *Hon. Sec.*, 183 West Street.

READ THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT FOR THE TRUTH ABOUT RUSSIA.

The Progressive Book-shop.

Hours 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. Saturdays, 9 to 5.
Orders by post attended to immediately.
N. B. — Books bought for Cash.
H. W. Edwards, 68 Red Lion St., Holborn, W.C. 1
(Near Chancery Lane Tube Station).

NEWS FROM SOUTH WALES. By F. P.

South Wales has experienced very stirring times, and the spirit displayed in the attitude of the rank and file is pleasing. Both the Government and the miners' representatives need think twice before attempting any trickery that may jeopardise the conceeding of the whole Charter, and nothing but the Charter.

The announcement that the miners' representatives, in conjunction with the Government, are negotiating not upon the Miners' Charter, but upon the basis of the Sankey Report, is received with grave distrust. Rank and file meetings were held on Sunday last to consider the Report of Friday's Delegate Conference, and many districts, in spite of the recommendation to work on day to day contract until Wednesday, were on strike on Monday and Tuesday. This is, indeed, a fine exhibition of spirit, and it will show the miners' representatives that there is no need for compromise when victory is nigh, for the rank and file are solidly behind them.

This action will also show the leaders that the rank and file will not permit them to deviate one jot from the original demands, and if any contrary course is taken by the leaders, the banner of victory will be carried forward in spite of them by the rank and file.

A great deal has been said of the need for unity at the present time, but let the Federation officials bear in mind, that unity can only be achieved on the basis of the original Charter, and that disunity can only come about if they attempt to accept from the Government anything but the Charter. They have a straight issue before them, as straight and concise as any set of officials ever had. Let the miners' representatives consider the rank and file have discussed and voted upon the proposals: 30 per cent increase of wages; 6 hour day; nationalisation of mines, and full pay for returning soldiers and sailors unable to obtain work. That Charter must be the basis for discussion, at any rate, thus spake an overwhelming majority of the miners of Great Britain. If the leaders attempt to negotiate on the basis of the Sankey report they will have no right to complain if the rank and file take action into their own hands. The majority Report states in no unmistakable terms that the miners are justified in their present demands. Then why need there be discussion on the Minority Report. Let Smillie and his colleagues remember that the question of unity or disunity is entirely in their hands, and that the rank and file are solid in fighting for grim death for *their own* Charter, but not so solid will they be to fight for something other than the Charter.

In no unmistakable tones, the miners, through the ballot, have told the Executive "Our Charter or down Tools"; let the leaders carry out that mandate faithfully and victory with unity of action is assured.

INCOME TAX.

Income Tax on wages has been for some time a burning question, and when this present fight is over, the abolition of Income Tax will be "on the cards." With the new increases of wages more will be liable to pay Income Tax, and it will certainly draw a large number of married men, who are now exempt, into the £130 radius. If the spirit shown in favour of the abolition of Income Tax retains its force, no more tax will be paid after the end of the present financial year. That's the stuff to gie 'em.

COMPENSATION.

One of the crying shames in the mining industry is the payment (?) of compensation to the cripples of industry. While the local owners have been making exhorbitant profits, injured miners have been receiving the miserable pittance of 25*s.* a week, which before the war was 20*s.* Can any one with five or six children live, nay, drag along, on 25*s.* a week. No, no one can. Increase of compensation to full wages must, and will be, on the next charter, and time surely.

MINERS' WIVES.

I am glad to think the Welsh women have not allowed Sir Thomas Watson's slighting remarks to go unchallenged. It must be remembered that Sir Thomas has not to depend upon *one* woman for his comfort, but can have a retinue of servants, probably daughters of miners. The time will surely come when Sir Thomas will have a chance of trying how only one woman will be able to tend to his comforts. Anybody who doubts the arduous work or slavery a miner's wife has to endure had better try a few months at looking after a home, where the father and two or three sons have to work in the pit, and then talk from experience.

Resolutions galore have been sent to Sir Thomas Watson by Women's Guilds strongly protesting against his insulting remarks that the Welsh miner's wife is not as economical as a French miner's wife, nor as clean. One Women's Guild maintained that it was an old game of capitalism to try and lower the wages of one section of workers by pointing out how another set of workers is more economical and thrifty. That's an old game, for the less it costs to keep the worker and his family, the less wages will he require. Bravo! the Welshwomen have shown that Celtic blood still runs through their veins.

THE MASSES.

A Monthly Journal of Industrial Unionism.

TWOPENCE. TWOPENCE.

Owing to the arrest and imprisonment of the Editor, W. F. WATSON, THE MASSES is now in the hands of THE MASSES EDITORIAL AND PUBLISHING COMMITTEE, and all communications should be addressed to THE BUSINESS MANAGER, THE MASSES, 7 Featherstone Buildings, Holborn, London, W.C.1.

The APRIL issue will be ready on MONDAY, APRIL 7th, and will contain a detailed report of the RAMSAY—WATSON cases, including WATSON'S speech from the dock.

IMPORTANT.

All Newsagents and Railway Bookstalls throughout the country will supply "The Workers' Dreadnought" if you only place your order. The paper is *now* on "sale or return."

Printed by J. R. Francis, 11 and 13 Bream's Buildings, London, E.C.4, and Published by the Workers' Socialist Federation, at 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

ORIGINAL DEFECTIVE.